

MSR Stakeholder Working Group

Los Alamitos/Seal Beach/Rossmoor/Sunset Beach Focus Area

June 15, 2004

Meeting Minutes

(Approved August 20, 2004)

I. Call to Order:

The meeting began at 6:00 pm. All stakeholders were in attendance, except Russ Lightcap (Public Representative for Rossmoor) and Nick Rini (Public Representative for Seal Beach).

Facilitator asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak. There were no public comments.

Facilitator asked if there were any comments or changes to the minutes from the May 17th meeting. Working group member commented that he sent his change via email to LAFCO staff. Minutes will be distributed to working group with noted change for final comment/approval.

II. Review Agenda and Desired Outcomes

The facilitator reviewed the order of the meeting and its desired outcomes.

III. Review DRAFT "Quality of Life" Criteria

Drafts of the quantifiable and non-quantifiable "Quality of Life" criteria prepared by LAFCO were distributed to the working group members. Members were reminded that the drafts represented previous input from the working group and were now ready for final consideration. The group was also reminded that the criteria could be used to assist the group in selecting alternatives for addressing existing and future area gaps, challenges and issues (i.e., The criteria can aid them in selecting the alternatives that best help them achieve the collective quality of life they have agreed to and want to maintain.).

Working group members recommended the following changes to the draft criteria:

- Quantifiable Criteria -- Expand the "public services" component and list the full spectrum of services (i.e., water, sewer, code enforcement, planning, police, etc.)
- Quantifiable Criteria -- Add "A full spectrum of public services is fully funded" as a separate bullet point under the "public services" area

- Add a preamble to the quantifiable and non-quantifiable criterion that states that the criterion is only a “starting point” and represents at minimum what the agencies and communities would do to maintain or enhance the quality of life for the area

Decision Point – Working Group approved the quantifiable and non-quantifiable quality of life criterion with changes. *Adopted by consensus*

IV. Identify Gaps, Challenges, Opportunities

Working group members engaged in a brainstorming discussion of the existing/future gaps, challenges, and opportunities for the area.

The following gaps/challenges/opportunities were identified:

- Lack of funding
 - County can no longer provided municipal services to unincorporated areas
 - Ability to fund the quality of life as defined by the working group
 - Cities need additional funds beyond what they have to serve existing territory and potentially serve unincorporated areas
- How do unincorporated areas remain autonomous in light of funding issue?
- Opportunities = Joint Power Authority (JPAs)
- How do we maintain distinct identities?
- Land use
 - non-revenue generating property
- Transportation
 - 405
 - 22 Expansion
- Enhanced city/community coordination
 - water
 - sewer
 - emergency services
 - recreation
- Governance
 - if County withdraws, impact on unincorporated areas
- Elected officials’ views on self-governance
 - leadership required to consider alternatives

Working group took a short break.

Upon return from break, member of the press requested to be allowed to speak directly/individually to working group members. Working group reiterated the

group decision made during a prior meeting to refer all press inquiries to the LAFCO staff.

V. Identify Possible Alternatives

Working group members identified the following possible alternatives to address the existing and potential gaps, challenges, and opportunities for the MSR focus area:

- Consolidation of services
 - What poses the best opportunities for JPAs?
 - Pros & cons
 - Conceptual fiscal
 - Review law
 - Examples of successful JPAs
 - Create or enhance Community Service Districts (CSD) for County unincorporated areas
 - How will CSDs be funded?
 - Models of other CSDs
 - Are state law changes needed?
 - Other ways to fund services
- Review of special districts
 - How many?
 - What are they?
 - Duplication?
- State legislation/Governance alternatives
 - Borough
 - Township
 - Other
 - Short of annexation/incorporation, other approaches?
 - Pros & cons

LAFCO staff stated that in addition to the alternatives identified by the group, it may look at additional alternatives to address their required nine determinations and findings. LAFCO staff stated that these alternatives may include:

- Formation of one city to include all of the areas located within MSR focus area
- Annexation of unincorporated areas to an adjacent city
- Other alternatives identified by consultant

LAFCO staff clarified that although the additional alternatives may not be included in the 20-year vision plan completed by the Working Group, an analysis of the additional alternatives will be included in the LAFCO MSR Report.

Working Group member asked if the LAFCO MSR Report will be available for the Working Group to review. LAFCO staff responded that the report will be available to the working group prior to being presented to the Commission.

VI. Summary and Next Steps

LAFCO staff stated that Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), an independent consultant hired by LAFCO, will be assisting in preparing the preliminary analysis of the alternatives identified by the working group, as well as any additional alternatives developed by LAFCO and/or EPS. LAFCO staff added that EPS specializes in conducting fiscal analyses for urban areas and has a strong reputation in its field. If working group members would like additional information on the firm, their website has been referenced in the MSR workbooks.

LAFCO staff will begin conversing with EPS. It is expected that EPS will present the analysis to the working group at the next meeting in August.

LAFCO staff stated that the June 29th and July 19th meetings are cancelled to allow EPS sufficient time to complete the preliminary analysis of the identified alternatives. It was also mentioned that other future meeting dates and times need to be adjusted because of conflicts for the meeting facility. LAFCO staff will contact working group members at a later date to reschedule August and September meetings.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:35 p.m.